CMER Prioritization Workshop
December 19, 2002
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes

Attendees:

Bresler, Helen	DOE
Calhoun, John	ONRC
Carlson, Margen	CMER Intern
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, Bill	DOE
Glass, Domoni	GECI
Green, Matthew	DOE
Grizzel, Jeff	DNR
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Keller, Steve	NOAA Fisheries
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McFadden, George	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	Adaptive mgmt Program Administrator
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC
Parks, Dave	DNR
Pederson, Steve	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Price, Dave	WDFW
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	CMER co-chair
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Consulting Group
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Agenda:

1. goals of workshop
2. review results of pre-ranking
3. clarify programs for ranking (rule tool and monitoring tool differences)
4. ranking effectiveness programs
5. ranking status and trend programs
6. ranking rule tools
7. review ranking results
8. program strategy (e.g. project importance)

Summary of Decisions and Tasks:

Page 3: Facilitation of CMER Business Meetings	Proposal was approved as submitted.
Page 4: rule tool ranking process	CMER will complete the rule tool ranking based on two or three appropriate questions to be recommended by the co-chairs and agreed upon by CMER. CMER will then approach DNR and review the rankings with them. DNR will provide input and then the results will be finalized and forwarded to policy.
Page 4: procedure for moving ranking process forward to policy.	CMER agreed that risk and uncertainty will be weighted the same (risk will not be weighted higher). The ranking committee will look at the individual results and ensure that the middle rankings are not the results of bimodal splits. The rankings will be reported for each program and CMER will have time to review these rankings and comment to the co-chairs and CMER staff. A final draft product will then be forwarded to CMER for review, and if there is disagreement on those rankings, CMER will discuss it during the January 23 CMER meeting and will either reach consensus or clearly depict the disagreement for policy consideration.

Goals of workshop: Quinn explained that the goals of the workshop are to reach consensus on a ranking process that allows us to get results by the end of the day. These results will be forwarded to FFR Policy for their January 29th work session. We will need to develop a process for ranking rule tools and status and trend monitoring projects.

Problems with project ranking: Quinn said that not all of the projects were able to be ranked using the uncertainty and risk criteria. If ranking is accomplished by program rather than project, this problem is alleviated. After talking with many CMER

participants who were supportive of program ranking, it was decided that program ranking was preferable. It will also help policy as they consider the rankings in January.

The CMER co-chairs and staff met and arranged the effectiveness projects into program areas and the co-chairs are proposing that we review the program boundaries to ensure that the proposed categories correctly reflect project types.

Review Results of Pre-Ranking: Palmquist said that the ranking was done by pasting individual scores into the spreadsheet and then averaging these scores for risk and uncertainty. The average risk was then multiplied by the average uncertainty resulting in a final project ranking. There are three categories in the spreadsheet: risk score, uncertainty score, and total score. Most of the projects ranked high for uncertainty and high for risk, but there were outliers for almost all ranked projects. Also, the idea of uncertainty and risk was subjective and people tended to think about it in different ways. The end product does suggest that a programmatic ranking process would work well because groups of projects tended to fall in the same scoring area.

Clarify programs for Ranking (Rule tool and monitoring tool differences): A handout reflecting the proposed program categories was distributed to the group and reviewed on the screen. The proposal was not as broad as the rule proposal seen earlier in November and reflected in the November budget sheet. A few minor changes were made to the proposal and CMER staff made these changes during the lunch time and redistributed the categories in the afternoon for ranking.

Facilitation Proposal: Pleus distributed a proposal from the handbook committee for facilitation services for CMER business meetings.

CMER Consensus: After brief discussion, this proposal was approved as submitted.

Ranking Effectiveness Programs: Schuett-Hames reviewed the criteria for ranking uncertainty and risk. Ranking was then completed by CMER and compiled by staff

Rule Tools: Quinn said that rule tools are unique because they are those things that the regulator needs to do business (DNR). CMER may not be the best body to rank these tools. Therefore, the co-chairs are proposing that since CMER believes all rule tools are important if they are necessary to implement the rule, a small group including DNR as a lead should be the body that ranks these tools. This would better define CMER's role when DNR comes to CMER with rule tool requests. CMER discussion ensued and there was concern with designating DNR as the lead for prioritization in this. Possibly, DNR could bring their prioritization to CMER, but CMER would have the ultimate responsibility to prioritize the rule tools projects for policy.

Martin said that the co-chairs do not think rule tools fit well with the risk/uncertainty ranking process. The ranking group (Pavel group) did propose a system for ranking rule tools that is very clear and could be used as the process. There are some projects that will be either/or, you develop the tool or you monitor effectiveness. On these, CMER will need policy guidance.

Further discussion ensued and resulted in the following consensus agreement.

CMER Consensus: CMER will complete the rule tool ranking based on two or three appropriate questions to be recommended by the co-chairs and agreed upon by CMER. CMER will then approach DNR and review the rankings with them. DNR will provide input and then the results will be finalized and forwarded to policy.

Review Ranking Results: A matrix was shown on the screen. Most programs ranked toward the middle area of the graph (medium uncertainty and risk). Three programs were ranked high for uncertainty and for risk. Mobbs asked how CMER plans to use this information to communicate with policy. It may be that it makes sense to push the top three projects forward quickly and work on the others as time allows. Sequencing the projects in the lower ranking would be good. Further discussion ensued surrounding how to use and describe the ranking results. This discussion resulted in the following CMER consensus.

CMER Consensus: CMER agreed that risk and uncertainty will be weighted the same (risk will not be weighted higher). The ranking committee will look at the individual results and ensure that the middle rankings are not the results of bimodal splits. The rankings will be reported for each program and CMER will have time to review these rankings and comment to the co-chairs and CMER staff. A final draft product will then be forwarded to CMER for review, and if there is disagreement on those rankings, CMER will discuss it during the January 23 CMER meeting and will either reach consensus or clearly depict the disagreement for policy consideration.